

Remarks

Claims 1–27 are pending in the application. Claims 1–27 are rejected. Amendments to the application are shown above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1–27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotick (U.S. 6,559,867) in view of Buxton (U.S. 6,469,714).

In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider, the Applicant's reply focuses on the independent claims. The patentability of each dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, Applicant's decision not to address the differences between the cited references and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusions that these dependent claims are not patentable over the cited references. Similarly, Applicant's decision not to address differences between the references and every claim element or every comment made by the Examiner should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims.

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A method for providing a selection of properties for an electronic document associated with an application program having a user interface, comprising the steps of:
determining a context for the electronic document;
determining a status of a property for the electronic document; and
based upon the context of the electronic document and the status of the property,

creating a customized palette for the user interface so that the palette comprises a control only for an available property for the electronic document and excludes controls for unavailable properties for the electronic document; and

displaying the palette in conjunction with the electronic document on the user interface such that said palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure viewing of said electronic document, wherein the displayed palette excludes displayed controls for the unavailable properties for the electronic document.

No new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least page 19, line 30, to page 20, line 2, of the Applicant's specification as originally filed.

On page 3 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Kotick fails to teach determining a context of an electronic document and customizing a palette based upon the context of the electronic document. The Examiner cites Buxton as disclosing these claim limitations.

Buxton is directed to an infocenter user interface for applets and components. Buxton discloses a desktop 300 that includes infocenter 320. Infocenter 320 includes an action bar 322 having action items 324 and main menu items 326 (FIG. 3A; col. 7, lines 5-8). Action items 324 may toggle on or off to show the current status of the selected object. Action items 324 that are not available in the current context are dimmed. For example, action item Paste is dimmed when nothing is on the clipboard

(col. 7, lines 59–67). However, Buxton fails to disclose or suggest that action items that are not available in the current context are excluded from the action bar. Using Buxton's example, Buxton does not disclose or suggest excluding the action item Paste from being displayed in action bar 322 when nothing is on the clipboard.

Thus, Buxton fails to disclose or suggest “based upon the context of the electronic document and the status of the property, creating a customized palette for the user interface so that the palette comprises a control only for an available property for the electronic document and excludes controls for unavailable properties for the electronic document... wherein the displayed palette excludes displayed controls for the unavailable properties for the electronic document” as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Kotick and Buxton, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 14 and 27 distinguish over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2–13 and 15–26 and are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above, it is submitted that all rejections and/or objections to the application have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be allowed, and that a timely Notice of

Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension of time fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463. Any overpayment may be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: July 2, 2007

By: /A. H. Azure/

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0399
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

July 2, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Printed Name

Reply to Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2007
Application Number: 09/770,337
Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01